



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,241	07/03/2003	Curtis Brian Williamson	5635	4754
John E. Vick, Jr. Legal Department, M-495 PO Box 1926 Spartanburg, SC 29304				
7590 10/15/2007				
EXAMINER				
JUSKA, CHERYL				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/15/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/613,241

Applicant(s)

WILLIAMSON ET AL.

Examiner

Cheryl Juska

Art Unit

1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment filed August 8, 2007, has been entered. Claim 1 has been amended as requested. Claims 15-33 are cancelled. Thus, the pending claims are 1-14.
2. Said amendment is sufficient to overcome the 112, 1st rejection set forth in section 5 of the last Office Action (Non-Final Rejection mailed 05/11/07). Despite this advance the claims do not contain allowable subject matter for the reasons set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US 4,617,208 issued to Cadenhead, Sr.

It is noted that the presently recited process limitations of amended product-by-process claim 1 are not necessarily given patentable weight at this time. It is the examiner's position that

the final product of Cadenhead is identical or only slightly different than the presently claimed pile fabric prepared by the method presently claimed for the reasons set forth below. Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or an obvious variant from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964.

Cadenhead teaches a process for making a cut pile, tufted carpet having non-directional pile (abstract). The process comprises the steps of:

- (a) knitting a thermoplastic yarn into a deknittable fabric,
- (b) heating the fabric to a temperature so that the bends and curves of the yarn generated by its knitted configuration is established in the yarn's memory,
- (c) cooling the fabric,
- (d) deknitting the cooled fabric and rewinding the yarn under enough tension to restraighen it,
- (e) tufting the yarn into a primary backing,
- (f) backcoating the tufted primary backing with an adhesive backcoat, and
- (g) heating the backcoated and tufted carpet to a temperature at which the pile yarn reconforms to the bends and twists of the knitted configuration in its memory.

The pile yarns may be of any cross-sectional shape, but are preferably ribbon shaped, and are preferably made of polypropylene, nylon, or polyester (abstract, col. 1, lines 40-59, and col. 2, lines 21-32).

Since the deknitted yarn is “restraightened” prior to tufting, applicant’s recitation to providing a pile portion of “non-textured fibers” is met by Cadenhead’s disclosure. Additionally, applicant’s recitation of “lateral blooming” is met by Cadenhead’s teaching that the yarn is latently bulked (i.e., the yarn reconforms to its knitted configuration stored in its memory upon heating to appropriate temperature). Furthermore, note Figure 3 of Cadenhead which shows said bulking or blooming occurs in a lateral fashion, thereby providing coverage between rows of tufts.

Hence, Cadenhead teaches the limitations of claims 1-6 and 11-13 with the exception of the recited “average void area” property. However, it is reasonable to presume that said property is inherent to the invention. Support for said presumption is found in the use of similar materials (i.e., self-bulking yarns capable of bulking upon heat treatment) and in the similar production steps (i.e., tufting latently bulkable yarns into a primary backing and exposing to heat to bulk said yarns) used to produce the carpet. The burden is upon applicant to prove otherwise. *In re Fitzgerald*, 205 USPQ 495. In the alternative, the claimed property would obviously have been provided by the process disclosed by Cadenhead. Note *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 433, footnote 4 (CCPA 1977) as to the providing of this rejection under 35 USC 103 in addition to the rejection made above under 35 USC 102. Therefore, claims 1-6 and 11-13 are rejected as being anticipated by or obvious over the Cadenhead reference.

Claims 7-10 and 14 are also rejected under 102 or 103 since said claims are drawn to process limitations which are not given patentable weight at this time. Said process limitations do not appear to produce a structurally different product from the Cadenhead product. The presence of process limitations on product claims in which the product does not otherwise

Art Unit: 1794

patentably distinguish over the prior art, cannot impart patentability to the product. *In re Stephens*, 145 USPQ 656. Therefore, claims 7-10 and 14 are also rejected.

Conclusion

6. The art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
8. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.
9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl Juska whose telephone number is 571-272-1477. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 10am-6pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached

at 571-272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Cheryl Juska/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1794